

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,340	01/19/2006	David W. Old	17609 (AP) PCT-US	2106
7590 02/01/2008 Robert J. Baran Allergan, INC.			EXAMINER SHIAO, REI TSANG	
2525 Dupont D: T2-7H	rive		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Irvine, CA 9261	12	•	1626	
			VVIII 21770	- DELIVERY MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
•	10/565,340	OLD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Rei-tsang Shiao, Ph.D.	1626				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap		h the correspondence address				
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING [ - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC .136(a). In no event, however, may a red will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT te, cause the application to become ABA	ATION. ply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19.	January 2006.					
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☑ Th	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-30 are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed onis/ are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examin	cepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyand ction is required if the drawing(s	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documer  2. Certified copies of the priority documer  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Appority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		/Mail Date formal Patent Application 				

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-30 are pending in the application.

#### Election/Restriction

**2.** Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

## Lack of Unity Requirement

- 3. This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions, which are not so linked as to form a single inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.
  - Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula
     (I), wherein the variable Z represents alkyl, cycloalkyl, aromatic radical, or heterocyclic aromatic radical benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl (i.e., formula (IV) represents

benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl or 3-chloro-benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl) thereof;

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

II. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn compounds/compositions of formula (I), wherein the variable Z represents alkyl, cycloalkyl, aromatic radical, or heterocyclic aromatic

radical benzo[b]thiophen-2-yl thereof; the variable R represents hereof, variables W, Y, R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>2</sup>, and R<sup>3</sup> are as defined in claim 1, and methods of use (i.e., treating ocular hypertension). If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose.

III. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), wherein the variable Z represents the formula (IV) of claim 4 thereof, and wherein the variable A represents N, and the variable U represents O or S thereof; the

variable R does <u>not</u> represents  $\stackrel{\sim}{N}$ , variables W, Y, R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>2</sup>, and R<sup>3</sup> are as defined in claim 1, and methods of use (i.e., treating ocular hypertension). If this group is elected, applicants are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose. This group is subject further restriction if it is elected.

IV. Claims 1-30, in part, drawn to compounds/compositions of formula (I), containing compounds not compassed in the Group I-III. If this group is elected, applicants

Art Unit: 1626

are requested to elect a single species for the search purpose. This group may be subject further restriction if it is elected.

Upon thorough consideration of the claims, the examiner has determined that a lack of unity of invention exists, as defined in Rule 13.

PCT Rule 13.1 states that the international application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept ("requirement of unity of invention").

PCT Rule 13.2 states that unity of invention referred to in Rule 13.1 shall be fulfilled only when there is a technical relationship among those inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

Annex B, Part 1(a), indicates that the application should relate to only one invention, or if there is more than one invention, inclusion is permitted if they are so linked to form a single general inventive concept.

Annex B, Part 1(b), indicates that "special technical features" means those technical features which as a whole define a contribution over the prior art.

Annex B, Part 1(c), further defines independent and dependent claims. Unity of invention only is concerned in relation to independent claims. Dependent claims are defined as a claim which contains all the features of another claim and is in the same category as the other claim. The category of a claim refers to the classification of claims according to subject matter, e.g. product, process, use, apparatus, means, etc.

Application/Control Number:

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

Annex B, Part 1(f) indicates the "Markush practice" of alternatives in a single claim. Part 1(f(i)) indicates the technical interrelationship and the same or corresponding special technical feature is considered to be met when: (A) all alternatives have a common property or activity, and (B) a common structure is present or all alternatives belong to a recognized class of chemical compounds. Further defining (B) in Annex B, Part 1(f)(i-iii), the common structure must; a) occupy a large portion of their structure, or b) the common structure constitutes a structurally distinctive portion, or c) where the structures are equivalent and therefore a recognized class of chemical compounds, each member could be substituted for one another with the same intended result. That is, with a common or equivalent structure, there is an expectation from knowledge in the art that all members will behave in the same way. Thus, the technical relationship and the corresponding special technical feature result from a common (or equivalent) structure which is responsible for the common activity (or property). Part 1(f(iv)) indicates that when all alternatives of a Markush grouping can be differently classified, it shall not, taken alone, be considered justification for finding a lack of unity. Part 1(f(v)) indicates that when dealing with alternatives, it can be shown that at least one Markush alternative is not novel over the prior art, the question of unity of invention shall be reconsidered, but does not imply that an objection shall be raised.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted. Again, this list is not exhaustive, as it would be impossible under the time constraints due to the sheer volume of subject matter instantly claimed. Therefore, applicant may choose to elect a

**Application/Control Number:** 

10/565,340 Art Unit: 1626

single invention by identifying another specific embodiment not listed in the exemplary groups of the invention and examiner will endeavor to group the same.

The claims herein lack unity of invention under PCT rule 13.1 and 13.2 since the compounds defined in the claims lack a significant structural element qualifying as the special technical feature that defines a contribution over the prior art, see Conrow's US 6,531,614. Accordingly, unity of invention is considered to be lacking and restriction of the invention in accordance with the rules of unit of invention is considered to be proper. Additionally, the vastness of the claimed subject matter, and the complications in understanding the claimed subject matter impose a burden on any examination of the claimed subject matter.

4. Applicants are advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

#### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rei-tsang Shiao whose telephone number is (571) 272-0707. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph K. McKane can be reached on (571) 272-0699. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Rei-tsang Shiao, Ph.D.

**Primary Patent Examiner** 

Art Unit 1626